

On September 13, the House voted 232-192 to instruct their conferees to agree to the Senate language, showing that a strong bipartisan majority of the House also wanted to strengthen and expand our laws against hate crimes.

But the conferees have now ignored the will of both the Senate and the House. They have dropped the Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act, which has the support of not just the Congress but the President and the American people.

Their objection cannot be that this legislation is unimportant. Hate crimes affect more than just their victims and their victims' families—they inspire fear in those who have no connection to the victim beyond a shared characteristic such as race or sexual orientation. When James Byrd, Jr. was dragged behind a pickup truck and killed by bigots in Texas for no reason other than his race, many African-Americans throughout the United States surely felt diminished as citizens. When Matthew Shepard was brutally murdered in Wyoming because he was gay, many gay people throughout the United States felt less safe on our streets and in their homes. These crimes promote fear and insecurity that are distinct from the reactions to other crimes, and House and Senate have both agreed that they should have distinct punishments.

The conferees' objection cannot be that this legislation is unnecessary. Bigotry and hatred are corrosive elements in any society, but especially in a country as diverse and open as ours. We need to make clear that a bigoted attack on one or some of us diminishes each of us, and it diminishes our Nation. As a Nation, we must say loudly and clearly that we will defend ourselves against such violence. All Americans have the right to live, travel and gather where they choose. In the past we have responded as a nation to deter and to punish violent denials of civil rights. We have enacted Federal laws to protect the civil rights of all of our citizens for more than 100 years. The hate crimes amendment this Senate approved and the House endorsed continues that great and honorable tradition.

The conferees' objection cannot be that this legislation is unconstitutional. This bill accomplishes a critically important goal—protecting all of our citizens—without compromising our constitutional responsibilities. It is a tool for combating acts of violence and threats of violence motivated by hatred and bigotry. The Constitution does not permit us in Congress to prohibit the expression of an idea simply because we disagree with it. As Justice Holmes wrote, the Constitution protects not just freedom for the thought and expression we agree with it. As Justice Holmes wrote, the Constitution

protects not just freedom for the thought and expression we agree with, but freedom for the thought that we hate. I am devoted to that principle, and I am confident that this bill does not contradict it.

The conferees' objection cannot be that this legislation has not been properly examined. In addition to gaining the approval of the Senate and the House this year, similar legislation passed the Senate last year. It has been the subject of great discussion in the general public and in the halls of Congress. It is long past time to act on this legislation.

Finally, the conferees' objection cannot be that hate crimes are rare occurrences. In addition to the terrible murders of Mr. Byrd and Mr. Shepard, the last years have seen the murder of former Northwestern basketball coach Ricky Byrdson and others in a bigoted Illinois shooting spree, the terrible sight of small children at a Jewish community center in Los Angeles fleeing a gunman who sprayed the building with 70 bullets from a submachine gun, and racially-motivated crimes in the Pittsburgh area by both African-American and white offenders. And these are just some examples of a wider phenomenon of hate-based crimes.

I would like to thank Senators KENNEDY and GORDON SMITH for their exhaustive efforts on behalf of hate crimes legislation. I regret that their efforts and the will of the House and Senate have been frustrated.

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, it has been more than a year since the Columbine tragedy, but still this Republican Congress refuses to act on sensible gun legislation.

Since Columbine, thousands of Americans have been killed by gunfire. Until we act, Democrats in the Senate will read the names of some of those who have lost their lives to gun violence in the past year, and we will continue to do so every day that the Senate is in session.

In the name of those who died, we will continue to fight. Following are the names of some of the people who were killed by gunfire one year ago today.

October 6, 1999:
Hector Colon, 34, Bridgeport, CT;
David Cook, 32, Kansas City, MO;
Raymond Foster, 32, Philadelphia, PA;
Michael Gatheright, 46, Detroit, MI;
Andres Geronimo, 15, Houston, TX;
Jose Godinez, 19, Chicago, IL;
Jerome Green, 40, Boston, MA;
Relendo McKarney, 21, Washington, DC;
Christopher Reese, 17, Fort Worth, TX; and
Ennis Walton, 29, Denver, CO.

We cannot sit back and allow such senseless gun violence to continue. The

deaths of these people are a reminder to all of us that we need to enact sensible gun legislation now.

THE PASSING OF PIERRE ELLIOT TRUDEAU

Mr. L. CHAFEE. Mr. President, last week the Canadian people learned of the passing of their former prime minister, Pierre Elliot Trudeau. His funeral, which took place on Wednesday, brought Canada's many political factions together for an unusual moment of unity. I would like to take this time to share with my colleagues my thoughts on this momentous event for our neighbors.

Pierre Trudeau led Canada at a time when that nation made enormous progress both internally and on the world stage. He served as prime minister from 1968 through 1984, with a brief nine-month hiatus in 1979-80. During these years, Trudeau championed many initiatives, and supervised the process by which Canada replaced its ties to Great Britain with a constitution of its own. His agenda affected Canadian politics for years after he left office.

Pierre Trudeau's private life certainly made many headlines, but his most enduring legacy was his success in addressing the separatist movement in his native Quebec. Just two years after assuming the prime minister's post, he won plaudits from the Canadian people for his toughness in dealing with separatist terrorists who had kidnapped a British diplomat and a Quebecois provincial official. Ten years later, in May 1980, Trudeau's leadership and persuasiveness convinced 59.6% of Quebecois to vote against separating from the national government. At the same time, though, he was sensitive to his country's French-speaking population; Canada was made officially bilingual in 1984.

I lived in Canada for seven years during the Trudeau era. As an American in this foreign-but-nearby land, I learned first-hand how Pierre Trudeau shaped and influenced the maturation of Canada. Although the United States and Canada certainly had their differences during this era, particularly on matters of arms control, I know that our nation fully respected his abilities and leadership qualities that guided Canada through some momentous times. Our friendly neighbor to the north has lost a great leader, and I hope all of my colleagues will take a moment to recognize the enormous legacy of Pierre Elliot Trudeau.

THE HAZARD SUPPORT SYSTEM

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, Benjamin Franklin once described how "for want of nail the shoe was lost; for want of a shoe the horse was lost; and for want of a horse the rider was lost."